

**MINUTES  
OF THE  
HISTORIC PRESERVATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (HPAC)  
OF  
ARIZONA STATE PARKS  
MEETING OF January 28, 2008  
8401 W. Monroe St.  
Peoria, Arizona**

**A. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

Chair Thorne called the meeting to order at 10:05am.

Committee Members Present:	Winston Thorne, Chair Tess Nesser Vice-Chair Joe Nucci Bonnie Bariola Charles Ebner
----------------------------	---

Committee Members Absent:	Tami Ryall
---------------------------	------------

Arizona State Parks Staff Present:	Doris Pulsifer, Chief of Grants Vivia Strang, Historic Preservation Grants Consultant Bill Collins, SHPO Ruth Shulman, Advisory Group Coordinator
------------------------------------	--

Guests:	Ron Short, City of Glendale
---------	-----------------------------

**B. INTRODUCTION OF MEMBERS AND STAFF**

Members and Staff introduced themselves.

**C. ACTION ITEMS**

**1. Approval of Minutes from the December 10, 2007 and December 17, 2007 Meetings**

Ms. Bariola asked for a correction to one sentence quoting Mr. Garrison of SHPO regarding the Historic Building Preservation Plan (HBPP) in the December 10, 2007 minutes. Ms. Shulman said that she would check the meeting tape and talk to Mr. Garrison, and make any necessary amendments. Ms. Bariola moved to approve the minutes as amended. Ms. Nesser seconded the motion, which carried with no further discussion.

Ms. Bariola moved to approve the minutes of December 17, 2007. Ms. Nesser seconded the motion, which carried with no further discussion.

**2. Presentation of FY2007 2<sup>nd</sup> Cycle Historic Preservation (HP) Heritage Fund Grant Applications**

Ms. Pulsifer opened the discussion by introducing the Historic Preservation (HP) Heritage Grant Program process. In each cycle, staff reviews incoming applications strictly for eligibility. Eligibility is defined as having a signed application, a signed resolution with matching fund information, workshop attendance certificate, a SHPO certification regarding the applicant's consultation with SHPO, and other documents regarding the applicant's ability to properly apply. No review of the application's scope items takes place at this time. The rating team, including the

## HPAC Minutes

### January 28, 2008

HPAC liaison appointed in 2007, meets on February 19, 2008 to rank the applications, and arrive at a consensus score for the applications. At this time, ineligible scope items, National Register Nomination (NRN) eligibility, and any other issues that may arise affecting the application's eligibility to receive a grant are discussed. The team makes a recommendation to HPAC on successful applications. At the meeting of March 17, 2008, HPAC will receive the recommendations and make their decisions to forward to Arizona State Parks Board (ASPB) for final action.

Ms. Strang began by noting that the typical HP grant application is a large, intricate document with an original and five copies. As each application arrives, SHPO reviews the project information for adherence to the Secretary of Interior standards. This aids the rating team in reaching their rating decisions.

The rating team typically consists of four members who vary from cycle to cycle. The HPAC liaison for this cycle is Tami Ryall. The rating team uses the rating form when they individually read the applications. Ms. Strang reiterated the consensus nature of the rating. As of December 28, 2007, eleven applications had arrived. There are ten applications being presented at this meeting. The eleventh application, for the Safford Theater, was deemed ineligible as it lacked any project narrative or any basis for rating. Ms. Strang has informed the applicant by letter of this decision and has spoken with them personally about options going forward. Ms. Bariola asked if the Safford applicants had attended the workshop. Ms. Strang said they had attended, and noted that multiple grant writers had worked on the application project. In response to a question from Chair Thorne, Ms. Strang also said that the "Attachment A" Heritage Fund Calculation report will be discussed following the application presentation.

Ms. Strang presented the current cycle of applications received:

#### **1. Arizona Department of Administration: Evans House – Requesting \$85,250**

This 1893 Queen Anne Victorian is in need of foundation repair and fire exit signage in addition to roof rehabilitation/repair. An HBPP has been prepared.

#### **2. City of Bisbee: HBPP for Bisbee City Hall and the Copper Queen Library – Requesting \$30,000**

The City Hall was built in 1907, the Library in 1912. Bisbee is requesting an HBPP for both buildings, an NRN and stabilization/restoration. Chair Thorne asked about the scope item referencing a research document. Ms. Strang said that document is part of the NRN process. Chair Thorne said that might also be something that falls under the HBPP. Ms. Nesser asked if this grant was for plans only, and not bricks and mortar. Ms. Strang said the grant was for plans only.

#### **3. City of Douglas: Phelps Dodge Mercantile Building Restoration – Requesting \$150,000**

This 1903 building currently sports a stuccoed façade, which covers the original windows and removes some of the historic significance of the building. The restoration work will return the building to its earlier state. The planned end use is government offices. Ms. Bariola asked about the scope items regarding masonry, insurance and fees, and says she would like to provide a "heads-up" to the application review team. Chair Thorne asked whether the two photos shown at the presentation were taken from the same perspective, and whether the architectural "footprint" of the building is the same as the original. Mr. Ebner, who is from Douglas, replied that the building does have the same footprint, but the photo perspectives are different. Ms. Nesser asked if insurance/fees are an eligible scope item. Ms. Strang said that a determination on that item will be made by the review team when the applications are reviewed.

Mr. Nucci noted that the value to Staff of the questions coming from the membership at this presentation is to highlight areas that HPAC will be sensitive to when the recommendation on grant awards is made. Since this sensitivity is noted early in the process, it can help make the review team aware of items that might need a close look.

**4. Florence Preservation Foundation: Celaya/Long/Sweeney House Rehabilitation – Requesting \$100,000**

This application is a resubmission from the last grant cycle. The application includes an HBPP request. A notable feature of the house is the saguaro rib ceiling.

**5. City of Glendale: Catlin Court Historic District Phase II – Requesting \$87,680**

Phase I of Catlin Court included twelve homes, and the work is complete. The district has been expanded and ten homes have requested to participate in this grant application. There are many preservation professionals participating in the work being done at Catlin Court. Historic Preservation Deed are signed for each property. This application also requests bronze marker plaques for the buildings on the National Register, and also for the Historic Preservation Heritage Fund recognition.

Mr. Short, the City of Glendale Historic Preservation Officer, spoke about the Catlin Court project. The Catlin Court Historic District expanded this year, and now encompasses 22 blocks. He also noted the various tours of Glendale's historic districts, and plans for further tours in the future.

Both Ms. Bariola and Mr. Nucci gave kudos to the City of Glendale for their preservation efforts.

**6. International Sonoran Desert Alliance: Manual Arts Building/Curley School – Requesting \$59,400**

The planned final use of this building is as a “studio” for large or “dirty” art projects. Their scope of work includes the addition of restrooms and roof repair along with electrical repairs and more. The artist work/living spaces are nearly fully occupied.

**7. Jerome Historical Society: Audrey Headframe – Requesting \$60,777**

This headframe for the Little Daisy Mine was completed in 1918 and is the largest mine headframe in Arizona still extant. This is the first phase of a two-phase project. Ms. Nesser asked about the mine structure and its historic importance. Mr. Collins said that Jerome is on the National Historic Register as a National Historic Landmark, because of its mining activities. Items relating to the mines have historic importance as well. He also said that the headframe of a mine holds the “elevator” that lifted miners and more up and down the mineshaft. Ms. Bariola asked if it was still in its original site. Mr. Collins said he believed so.

**8. Jerome Historical Society: New State Motor Building Revitalization – Requesting \$145,870**

This 1918 building once contained an elevator used to lift automobiles from one level to the next, and has a unique concrete frame. The scope of work includes the second level revitalization including a mini-museum on the building and retail space. Ms. Bariola noted that she would like to see more detail on the scope items; she feels many are too vague.

**9. Pima County: Immaculate Conception Catholic Church – Requesting \$59,730**

This adobe has suffered damage due to leaks. The grant is requesting funding for an HBPP as well as emergency measures for the roof. The church is also located in Ajo, as is the Curley

School. Both Ms. Bariola and Chair Thorne mention concern over some scope items such as maintaining the church and grounds and a night security item.

**10. City of Tucson: Santa Cruz Catholic Church Roof – Requesting \$90,000**

This is the largest mud adobe building in Arizona and was the subject of an earlier grant several years ago. This grant application is for the repair of failing trusses and to repair cracks in the walls caused by the failure. Ms. Nesser asked whether the truss repair would be the best choice from an engineering standpoint. Ms. Strang noted that this is one reason SHPO reviews the applications as they arrive, so as to review the proposed for engineering soundness among other things. Both Mr. Nucci and Ms. Bariola mentioned scope items of concern to them, such as the lack of a BCA request and vaguely described items regarding construction. Chair Thorne asked that this application be reviewed with an eye toward the overall planning described.

Ms. Bariola noted that she had attended each of the all-day HP grant application workshops given for this grant cycle, and found them very helpful for grant applicants. However, she does not feel that the current “crop” of applications reflect the amount of instruction provided by the workshops. Chair Thorne noted that this presentation represents the big picture of the applications received, rather than the detail level. Ms. Strang also reminded HPAC that both she and SHPO are available for consultation to applicants as they prepare their applications.

Ms. Strang then noted that “Attachment A”, the Historic Preservation Fund Calculation document prepared by the Fiscal Administration department of ASP, shows the amount of money available for the second cycle of FY2007 Heritage Fund HP grants. This also includes funds that may be left over from an unfinished grant project, which is folded back into the available pool of money. Ms. Pulsifer also noted that the document is a reconciliation sheet and also covers information on how the Heritage Fund dollars are distributed to Parks for purposes other than grants, such as the SHPO set asides. The money available for this second FY2007 cycle amounts to \$671,499.47.

Chair Thorne asked about an item of \$327,122.50 shown. Ms. Pulsifer explained that this item was money received to apply to the FY2008 grant cycle, and is not included in the calculations for FY2007. Mr. Nucci said that this report helps to illustrate the current split of HP funds between 2/3 for the first cycle of the year and 1/3 for the second cycle.

Ms. Nesser asked if “left over” (deobligated) funds are a common occurrence. Ms. Strang said it is not. Ms. Nesser then asked if any of these deobligated funds go to award projects that were unable to be funded during an earlier cycle. Ms. Strang said that does not happen. Ms. Strang went on to say that the \$671,499.47 available will not cover the \$868,407 in requests on the current applications. She said this shows that the grant rating criteria is working quite well, and that poor projects will not be funded. Further discussion followed on the HP fund.

Mr. Ebner asked what happens in the case of project cost overruns. Ms. Strang noted that each applicant is responsible for any amount over the budget. All scope items for which the grant was approved must be completed. This is one reason why planning is such an emphasis in the grant criteria.

**3. Update and Discussion on Picket Post House**

Ms. Pulsifer said that she had spoken to ASP Assistant Director Jay Ream about this acquisition. She noted that HPAC supports the acquisition of the Picket Post House, but does not support using the entire Heritage Fund HP grant funding to pay for it. Mr. Ream said that he would be discussing the funding of the acquisition with HPAC once a purchase contract has been executed.

HPAC Minutes  
January 28, 2008

There are several options for payment under consideration at the moment. One option is to use money from the Heritage Fund as a whole, including the Local, Regional and State Parks (LRSP) funds, Heritage Trails funds and others. Along with this, funds might be obtained from the Acquisition and Development (A&D) Fund. One thought is that ASP will use up to the 20% cap of LRSP allowed in each grant cycle to provide funds for the purchase. This would be close to \$700,000 dollars at current LRSP fund levels. There are altogether four different scenarios under consideration.

The acquisition would take place in three pieces over three years. In other words, in the first year ASP would purchase 1/3 and lease 2/3 of the property, scaling the amount of purchase each time by 1/3 until ASP owns the property outright. The total cost of acquisition would be \$3 million dollars, which is in line with a current appraisal. Ms. Pulsifer also asked Mr. Ream about HPAC's concern for maintenance and future care of the property. Ms. Pulsifer noted that she has been told that while the house itself is obsolete, there are currently tours available that generate some income. The number of volunteers available at the Boyce Thompson Arboretum can supply volunteers as well to run the Picket Post House tours. The tours are expected to generate approximately \$20,000 annually. Ms. Pulsifer went on to say that once the acquisition is complete, some money will be set aside from the A&D fund for an HBPP. Once the HBPP is completed, the discussion will be held as to the financing of whatever work is necessary on the house. Ms. Pulsifer mentioned other income opportunities available. In the long term, there are different end-uses being discussed for income to provide the maintenance for the house.

Ms. Pulsifer also noted that this opportunity must be taken while it is available, as developers are looking to build in the area. This property is an inholding of Boyce Thompson Arboretum and development on that land will be injurious to the Arboretum. Mr. Ream has also noted that he will arrange for tours for HPAC.

Ms. Nesser noted that preventing destruction of historic properties by developers should be a priority of HPAC, even at the possible expense of grants. Ms. Pulsifer noted that there are several financing options under discussion, including outside grants to ASP. The possible impact to HP and HPAC is that there may have to be a return to one grant cycle annually. The ASPB has approved a set aside of \$700,000 from the HP grant program. However, the minutes of that Board meeting say that this set aside does not come with a commitment from the ASPB to buy the Picket Post House. Ms. Pulsifer interprets this to mean that the \$700,000 will not be used from the HP fund until the purchase is imminent, and will come from the 2008 budget. Applications for the first cycle of FY2008 are due the end of May, and the program is going forward as of now. There may not be a second FY2008 cycle. There may be a single cycle annually of HP grants for the next three years, even if acquisition funds are shared among those available.

Mr. Nucci said that he believes that kind of impact over three years is not at all valuable to either applicants or ASP. He wonders who has spoken about this acquisition with the University of Arizona, who has the primary responsibility for Boyce Thompson Arboretum, or other outside funding. He mentions that the LRSP 20% cap idea should possibly be applied to the HP grant funds as well. The current cap for HP grants is \$150,000. If the HP grant funds bear the brunt of the purchase, there will be a deleterious effect on the sole opportunity for bricks-and-mortar preservation in the entire state of Arizona.

Ms. Bariola asked if the Resolution Copper Mine Company has been approached as well. Ms. Pulsifer said that ASP Executive Staff has looked for outside funding in approaching the University of Arizona, Boyce Thompson Arboretum, Inc. and others, though she does not know whether Resolution Copper was approached specifically. Ms. Bariola noted that Resolution

HPAC Minutes  
January 28, 2008

Copper is making a public relations splash, and helping ASP could only be a win-win for the company. She also said that several newspaper articles on the budget difficulties faced by ASP and its existing parks have appeared recently. This acquisition may affect how ASP's budget issues are perceived by the average Arizonan.

Chair Thorne agreed with Ms. Bariola, and also noted that HPAC's function is to provide advice to the ASPB. The Board and ultimately all of ASP will benefit from an objective perspective on the advice given. There should be cohesiveness in the goals set by the ASPB in conjunction with HPAC. Chair Thorne said that he had attended the ASPB meeting on January 18. The report on the Picket Post House at that meeting was not in-depth and said that there was no purchase contract in place. The funding of the acquisition has not yet been decided. He feels that HPAC can provide its best advice to the ASPB when it has all the information available, especially on the purchase contract. The HP grant program is becoming more successful with each cycle, and hopes that ASPB takes this success into account in any decision on funding. He would for Mr. Ream to communicate with HPAC prior to the next HPAC meeting with further information.

Mr. Nucci said that he views the ASP acquisition of the Picket Post House as a form of grant application, especially with the use of HP Heritage Fund money. He would like to know how this acquisition would affect "the public good" in the long run. His feeling is that the public good will not be served 100% by this acquisition, and feels that the University of Arizona should be providing matching funds. Good advice must also be timely advice. Mr. Nucci then asked what action should be taken by HPAC at this moment. Ms. Pulsifer said that no action need be taken at this meeting, but the ultimate decision lies with HPAC.

Ms. Bariola asked if the letter of opinion she drafted had been seen by the ASPB. Chair Thorne responded that the letter had not yet been sent to the ASPB as it might be premature without the further information provided by Mr. Ream at this meeting. Ms. Nesser said that giving the ASPB HPAC's opinion prior to their next meeting would provide them with more information to make their ultimate purchase decision. Chair Thorne agreed, and noted that presenting the letter to the ASPB should probably not be agendaized for discussion by the ASPB. Ms. Bariola said that her understanding was that HPAC agreed by vote to send the ASPB their concerns. This information needs to be presented in writing for maximum effect. Further discussion on the presentation of the letter followed.

Chair Thorne asked Ms. Pulsifer about the next Board meeting, which she noted would be in late March. She also said that her understanding is that the HPAC would prefer that the letter not be part of the ASPB agenda packet, but that the Board should receive the letter separately. She recommended having the letter available to be sent no later than the first week of March.

(At this point Mr. Collins noted that he would not be able to stay for the remainder of the meeting as he had another commitment. He asked Chair Thorne if he could defer his SHPO reports to the March meeting. Chair Thorne agreed, and Mr. Collins left.)

Ms. Nesser asked why the letter of opinion should not be included in the ASPB agenda packet. Ms. Pulsifer said that if HPAC is forwarding their letter of opinion as an ASPB action item that would be premature for the ASPB March meeting. Sending it individually to the ASPB members might have a better effect. Ms. Bariola said that she believes the ASPB needs to have the information from HPAC as early as possible before they take any action on the Picket Post House purchase. The letter could be a part of the ASPB agenda packet as a report from the HPAC and not coming through ASP Staff. She would like to see the letter sent to ASP Executive Staff as well.

Mr. Nucci said that he would like to see a copy of the draft letter written by Ms. Bariola. Again, he feels that any advice for the ASPB must be timely to be useful and HPAC's opinion, especially the information on the affect to the HP grant program, should reach the ASPB as soon as possible.

Chair Thorne noted that all HPAC members should review the draft letter before it goes to the ASPB, to ensure that everyone's opinions are included. Considering the information presented by Ms. Pulsifer, the letter no longer seems premature, and will likely have more impact presented now. Further discussion on the letter followed.

Chair Thorne asked if all the HPAC members could review the letter and provide any input within the next few weeks. Each HPAC member will receive an eMail copy of the letter, and will provide feedback directly to Staff. Mr. Nucci moved to send the draft letter previously prepared by Bonnie Bariola and reviewed by Staff and amended be distributed to each member of HPAC electronically by Staff for review and comment and barring any significant objections to that letter that the letter be sent to the Arizona State Parks Board with copies to HPAC members. Ms. Nesser seconded the motion. Mr. Nucci added that he would like to see the letter for comment by HPAC by February 1, 2008. The vote was taken, and the motion carried with no further discussion.

## **D. REPORTS AND UPDATES**

### **1. Parks Board Action on HPAC Items**

Ms. Pulsifer noted that both recommendation recently referred to the ASPB were favorably acted on by the ASPB. Those items were the appointment of HPAC members to serve beginning January 1, 2008, and the changes to the FY2008 Historic Preservation Heritage Fund Grant Manual.

### **2. Heritage Fund Report**

Ms. Pulsifer said that the distributions from the Heritage Fund are currently on target. The Heritage Fund expects to be fully funded as of April 2008. Mr. Ebner asked if the Arizona State Legislature is looking at making cuts or "sweeping" any of the Fund money. Ms. Pulsifer said that so far the Fund is "safe" but the Legislature is looking at it as source of budget shortfall correction money.

### **3. New Travel Policies**

Paulina Payan of ASP's Administrative staff and Vicky Trevino of ASP's Human Resources Department gave a brief presentation on the new reimbursement method for travel expenses in Arizona State Parks. Ms. Payan gave packets with information and documents to be completed to each HPAC member. The reimbursement changes became effective January 1, 2008. Payments will now be made through the Human Resources system on the same schedule as pay-day for state employees. HPAC members must also complete a new W-9 IRS form and a form that will allow information to be entered into the Human Resources system. The Administrative contact in ASP for travel is Toni Leon, and her contact information was provided. Ms. Shulman is also available to answer member's questions.

### **4. SHPO**

#### **Recent National Register Listings**

#### **Governor's Heritage Honor Awards Nominations**

HPAC Minutes  
January 28, 2008

**Statewide Preservation Partnerships Conference Planning  
CLG Program Pass-Through Applications**

These reports were deferred until the March 17, 2008 meeting of HPAC.

**E. CALL TO THE PUBLIC**

No public comment.

**F. SUMMARY OF CURRENT EVENTS, MATTERS OF BOARD PROCEDURE,  
REQUESTS AND ITEMS FOR FUTURE AGENDAS**

Mr. Nucci reminded HPAC of his request to receive a copy of a “good” HBPP from Mr. Garrison. Ms. Strang will remind Mr. Garrison of the request. Chair Thorne asked if there were a possibility of having a backup liaison available to the rating team. Mr. Nucci had said during a previous meeting that he is available to serve.

**G. TIME AND PLACE OF NEXT MEETING**

March 17, 2008 - Peoria

**H. ADJOURNMENT**

Chair Thorne adjourned the meeting at 12:35pm.